

Executive Registry

82-0471

STAT

February 5, 1982

Admiral Bobby R. Inman  
Deputy Director  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D.C. 20505

Dear Admiral Inman:

I am writing to you concerning the subject of an enclosed article which deals with the stopping of information leaks of technical information to potential enemies. Of course no one would argue with the intent of what is hoped might be accomplished to protect our national security but if what the press reports is true, these same actions may actually weaken our national security in other ways.

I realize it is highly presumptuous for me to advise the Agency of what action it should take in regards to this matter but I have taken the liberty of enclosing a chapter from the book Enough Good Men by Albert E. Burke (World Publishing Co., 1962.) which deals specifically with this issue as it regards the scientific community. Although it was published twenty years ago it still hold much relevance. I hope that you might have one of your analyst review this.

Sincerely,

*Joel N. Gordes*  
Joel N. Gordes

cc: D. Allan Bromley  
AAAS

# U.S. Information Control Efforts Alarming to Scientific Community

By LEE DEMBART  
Los Angeles Times

A technical paper that was published in a scientific journal several years ago explained to the oil industry an improved method for breaking rocks while drilling. According to the Department of Defense, the Russians picked up the technology and used it to build weapons that can destroy American tanks.

As a result of this and similar incidents the government cites, the Reagan administration is stepping up its efforts to clamp down on what it calls the "leakage" of technology to potential enemies.

But many scientists across the country are alarmed at the veiled and not so veiled threats from Washington to limit the free and open exchange of ideas and results that is the bedrock of the scientific enterprise.

"The anxiety that has now been created by the national security authorities produces the almost unavoidable conclusion that the government is pressing for censorship of some kind," said William D. Carey, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in a telephone interview.

In recent weeks, Frank C. Carlucci, the deputy secretary of defense, published a long letter in the journal *Science* urging an inhibition on the flow of information, and Adm. Bobby R. Inman, the deputy director of the CIA, told a scientific meeting in Washington that scientists may have to submit many papers to the government for pre-publication review to keep matters of national interest from leaking out.

Carlucci declined to be interviewed. But Inman returned a phone call promptly and declared, "This is a problem that's going to get a lot noisier in the months ahead."

"Scientists ought to start thinking about the forum and the vehicles for getting their ideas together on the larger issues of technology transfer that are clearly going to be on the public agenda."

"Far better for the scientists to be in a position to get in there and lobby and give advice rather than just to wait for the government to regulate."

Related to the publishing issue is the current dispute between the State Department and several universities over government-sought restrictions on what a visiting Soviet scientist may be shown and told.

As a result, many scientists see a concerted campaign on the part of the government to unnecessarily limit their freedom for little reason and with the prospect of little gain. They say American scientists have learned as much as they have lost from international exchanges, and they doubt whether the flow of knowledge can

*Many scientists see a concerted campaign on the part of the government to unnecessarily limit their freedom for little reason and with the prospect of little gain.*

be stopped regardless of what the government does.

Their cries of protest have begun appearing in the scientific journals.

"American scientists legitimately can question whether the government's new approach can achieve its goal without highly counterproductive and deleterious effects on the current structure of our research institutions," Edward Gurjeoy wrote in *Physics Today*.

At the same time, however, efforts are under way at the highest level of the government and the scientific community to begin an exchange that would result in the acceptance by scientists of some restrictions on what may be published.

Frank Press, the president of the National Academy of Sciences, said in an interview recently that the academy is willing to act as an honest broker in bringing the two sides together.

When Inman of the CIA spoke at the scientific meeting, he listed the following areas as particularly troublesome for the government: computers, electronic equipment and techniques, lasers, crop projections and manufacturing procedures.

While many people were alarmed by the sweep of the government's interest, Press said he thought Inman had spoken "off the top of his head," and added, "He just wants to start the dialogue."

And D. Allan Bromley, a Yale University physicist who is chairman of the board of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said by telephone:

"Bobby Inman was obviously making an extreme case. He was going to get the attention of everybody, and he sure did. But I don't for a moment believe that he really feels that one should clamp down to the extent that his remarks have been interpreted."

Bromley said he thought some compromise could be worked out by reasonable people on both sides.

"What worries me," he said, "is a kind of knee-jerk reaction on the part of the scientific community that, by God, nobody's going to infringe my publication rights, and the same knee-jerk reaction on the mili-

tary side that, by God, nobody's going to publish anything that I don't approve of. That kind of thing will lead to major loss both to the military and to the scientific community."

While the Reagan administration has brought renewed attention to the question, the issue is not new. Two years ago, the Carter administration prevented Soviet scientists from attending conferences here on lasers and bubble memories for computers.

A year ago, a committee of scholars urged researchers in the field of code-making and breaking to submit their research papers to the National Security Agency for pre-publication review. The suggestion followed a threat by the agency to ask Congress to pass a law prohibiting the publication of such work. The director of the National Security Agency during that dispute and its resolution was Inman, now No. 2 at the CIA.

Since the proposal for review was made, two dozen papers in cryptography have been submitted to the security agency, and all have promptly been approved for open publication. The system is still awaiting the first instance of a clash between a researcher and the government.

The chairman of the panel that proposed the pre-publication review in cryptography was Ira Michael Heyman, chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley.

In an interview last week, Heyman said he would not be willing to extend the cryptography system to cover all of the new areas that Inman had mentioned.

He said he had been willing to accept the infringement on freedom to publish because the subject matter that the government was concerned about was narrowly and precisely defined and the government had made a good case for the potential harm to the United States from open discussion of this work.

"Once you start to extend that principle to everything," Heyman said, "what I think it essentially means is that anything that's written in the sciences in general and certainly in any area of technology is going to be swept into this system. It's much, much too broad."

One of the problems that the government faces in proving the threat posed by continued publication of all technological research is its reluctance to be too specific about what the Russians have learned and how they have learned it.

In any case, he said, the government was willing to make its case in detail before a classified meeting of a congressional committee, and he expected hearings to be convened some time soon on the subject.

## CHAPTER 7

### Secrecy, Censorship, and Survival

THE POINT HAS BEEN MADE that education, modern, scientific education, is essential for the survival of our freedom. Americans cannot be a free people unless they can compete with the Soviet Union's scientific advances, and with the *use* of those advances for broad social purposes, from building dams to changing of the faces of seas and continents.

In considering the problems of education and of science, however, Americans must face another problem of their own making, the problem of secrecy and censorship. This, again, results from our deficiencies in education about the ways, and problems, and substance of science. This was made painfully clear during a meeting of British and American scientists sometime in the late 1940s.

They met during the research that was then going on to produce the hydrogen bomb. The purpose of that meeting was to deal with a problem that was serious then, and is serious now.